





LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY
OF ILLINOIS

enlisted. There must be no silly talk about interesting natives," &c.; no excited running fro, to more Missionary Meetings than they inwardly digest, while their own servants, and obvious claims of those at hand, are uncared for.

Our women at home, if they would be helpers to the truth, "must be "keepers at home; they must learn something of self-mastery and sacrifice; that so their witness may have power; those who see that their charity extends to the ends of the earth may also see that it "begins at home."

After all, the work is one, throughout the world. For there is but one Lord; and "He is our Great King over all the earth." "It is God who ruleth in Jacob,"—here, in the Church at home, "and unto the ends of the earth." Even the King must have His daughters, honourable wives.

If even the annals of Heathendom are often bright by the story of woman's devotion, and even the Spartan mother could add fortitude to her love, it not be reserved for Christian women to show more?

"A fairer strength than
Strength linked with weakness, steeped in tears and
And tenderness of trembling womanhood,
But true as hers, to Duty's perfect Law?"

Notes
of Syros

Appeal

Report

Bp. R.

Bp. R.

Bp. R.

Profes

Memo

Reform

Corres

Corres

(1) Old
the Artic

Resolu

The O

Rev. the

The O

St. Paul'

Corres

lightenm

the Valic

the Inter

of the Se

The S

With Su

Anglo-

minster

State

Russia, Constantinople, in 1875. 2d.

Summary Report of the Second Conference at Bonn. 1d.

Wholly allowed
Position of the Celebrant.

With the Author's Compt

1875

S P E E C H

OF

REV. ROBERT GREGORY, M.A.,

CANON OF ST. PAUL'S, AND PROCTOR IN CONVOCATION FOR THE
CHAPTER OF ST. PAUL'S,

DELIVERED IN

*THE LOWER HOUSE OF CONVOCATION OF THE
PROVINCE OF CANTERBURY,*

ON

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 14, 1875,

IN MOVING THE

FIRST RESOLUTION OF THE COMMITTEE ON RUBRICS.

~~~~~  
Published by Request.



## POSITION OF THE CELEBRANT.

---

MR. PROLOCUTOR,—I never rose to address this Convocation with a deeper sense of responsibility than at this moment. I feel that we have arrived at a crisis of the greatest possible magnitude, affecting the whole future of the Church of England, and the question I have to raise is one of the gravest moment to ourselves and our children. I must consequently be allowed to commend it to the serious and thoughtful consideration of my Reverend brethren; and in doing so it will be well for us to bear well in mind the circumstances under which the question at issue is brought before us.

When the Public Worship Act of last year became law it was thought desirable that its action should be suspended for twelve months, in order that the Church, by its representatives in Convocation, might come to decisions that would help to take off the sharp edge of the new law, which might otherwise spread ruin and devastation in a vast number of parishes all over the kingdom. It was to meet difficulties presumably about to be raised by the action of the new Court that we were to consider what would be the position of affairs in the future. There are two questions in dispute which have especially excited interest and anxiety; the one referring to the Position, and the other to the garb, of the Celebrant in the Administration of the Holy Communion, and to these points the Committee, in whose name it is my privilege to speak, was directed by this House to give its earliest attention. It was felt that it would be of great advantage and convenience to zealous and earnest members of the Church of England if these questions could be really settled by the Convocations of this country, whichever way the decision went. I know that the Clergy in their several Rural-deaneries



or Dioceses have met and expressed by considerable majorities that, in their opinion, no change should be made in the existing law. Before accepting that conclusion as decisive, as really representing their views and judgment on the subject, we must consider the circumstances under which this opinion was given. It is well known that at present the Clergy are much divided in their opinions and wishes upon the two points of which I am speaking; a considerable number hold to the one view, and a considerable number to the other. When, therefore, the Clergy met under these circumstances, each party feared lest it should be placed in a minority, lest the middle party should vote with its opponents, and that so it should suffer injury. To avoid this danger, and by a species of silent compromise, it was agreed to ask for no change in order to arrive at an apparent unanimity; and so to escape from a possible decision which would have been injurious to one or other of the great parties. When we saw extreme High Churchmen at ruridecanal meetings proposing to ask Convocation not to make any change, and extreme Low Churchmen seconding such a proposal, and men diametrically opposed to each other in what they wished the law of the Church to be about these disputed matters voting together, it is impossible not to conclude that each party was actuated by the fear of which I have just spoken; or, if not that, then that it hoped and expected to find the judgment of the new Court would be in its own favour, and in the confidence that the side it espoused would thus gain the victory it was content to trust the future. The voice of the Clergy, therefore, in their Rural-deaneries really then only amounts to this—that the two parties in the Church were more afraid of suffering loss, than hopeful of gaining what they desired, by pushing to a division consent to, or dissent from, the real conclusions at which they would have wished to arrive. It shows that opinion was felt to be so evenly divided that neither side dare act as though it had an assured majority. At present this lands us in no difficulty; but what has it done towards helping to tide us over those

troubles which must arise in the future? For what is our position now? Is it more defined or is it settled on a surer basis than it was a year ago? There is, I am aware, far less excitement; but will it continue to be so when we have a decision one way or the other? Should we then find more readiness to submit to the Court than there was some time ago—more willingness to concede to our brethren who were cast in the suit, whichever side it may be, that liberty which the Court had refused, than we should have seen some time ago? Practically, I fear we should not. I think we are in the same position now that we were then, and, that being the case, we have to consider what will be the state of things when the decision of the Court has been given; and surely as a matter of common prudence we ought now to determine what we shall then wish we had decided. On this account it is, I think, that there never was a time when it was more important for Convocation to say what in its opinion the good of the Church demands that the law should be.

We do not sit here as a judicial assembly to say what the law is, but as a legislative assembly we are now invited to say what in our opinion the rule of the Church in these two important matters ought to be. It is because we have to act in this capacity that it is so desirable for us to state clearly what we think the law should be, to state it now when there is a lull and men's minds are, comparatively speaking, tranquil, rather than to wait for a time when a judgment has been given, when a thrill is running through the Church, when men's minds are heated and excited, and naturally little disposed to moderation; a time when it is to be feared the victors might be crying for extermination, and the vanquished would have no defence but an appeal for mercy. In my opinion, then, we are bound at this time to speak with no uncertain voice; for we may now see more clearly what we ought to do than we can hope to do in an hour of excitement. We are now in this happy condition, that whatever we propose will not take immediate effect; whilst as inviting to moderation each side has

now before its eyes the possibility of being vanquished in the strife, which after the decision of the Final Court one side no longer will have. Whatever we do, we must be content to await the decision of the Court, for legislation this year is obviously out of the question, and before there can be legislation next year either the existing Court will have spoken, or the new Court will have uttered its interpretation of the existing law. If the Court decides in the manner we recommend, then obviously there need be no legislation at all. What we have, therefore, to consider is not what will happen if the decision should be in accordance with our desire for liberty, if that should prove to be our desire, as I trust it will, but what will happen if one or other of the existing positions should be pronounced by the Court to be the only legal one. We have to decide upon the best way of regulating this practically important question for the future. For my own part, I say unhesitatingly that whatever the Synods of the Church of England may ordain I shall obey *ex animo*. I would accept the ruling of the Church as my guide whatever that ruling may be, and however much it may be opposed to my own preferences and practice: I feel that I should be an unworthy son if I declined or refused to do so. I say this emphatically, and I say it especially, because I feel that the decision of this Synod would have a moral weight which would render compliance with it a moral duty; and surely this is a grave and important reason why we should come to a conclusion *now*, and not accept any mere motion for delay or postponement. This is a reason for our rejecting any procrastinating amendment which may be placed before us, the object of which is not to propose what its supporters wish, but to avoid the carrying of a resolution which they dislike. There are, I believe, thousands who feel as I do—thousands who would accept the decision of the Church's Convocations, but who would not look with equal deference upon any decision of a Court founded on a narrow construction of certain words in a rubric, and in the giving of which five Judges might be on one side

and four on the other ; and a decision when it might be that by an accident Judge A, who would have decided one way, was hindered from attending the Court by sickness or accident, and Judge B, who did decide in the opposite way, was substituted for him. Is it to be wondered at that under such circumstances the decision of a Court of law fails to carry with it that moral weight which would attach to the deliberate, well-weighed conclusions of the Synods of the Church? Is it not obvious that under such circumstances the Synods of the Church are bound to set forth a rule which will carry with it a moral force binding upon conscience?

I ought to say that I do not myself see any difficulty in interpreting the rubric in dispute : its words seem to me plain and clear, and capable of only one interpretation, and that the one which I place upon them ; but I do know that many of my brethren understand it quite differently, and it seems to them capable only of bearing a contrary interpretation to that which I attach to it ; to them I would give the same credit for really desiring to know what the Church directs by her law that I assert for myself, to them I would attribute the same honest desire to obey which I claim for myself. There is, therefore, a clear case of understanding the same words in opposite ways. In such a case, then, of doubt and difficulty, surely it is important that this Synod should state clearly and explicitly what is the wisest course to be pursued, what meaning it thinks ought to be attached to the words in dispute. Shall we say that one rule, and one only, should be allowed? Shall we say that we will restrict liberties which have existed in this Church of England ever since the time of the Reformation? or shall we permit this long-exercised liberty to continue, and trust to the growth of sound opinion to get rid of the differences of view which now exist? Much depends upon the answer we give to this question. I think I shall be able to prove the fact that such liberty has existed, and to show that it has existed unquestioned, in the Church of England since the Reformation.

But before I trouble the House with the evidence by which I hope to prove this, I will set before it a description of the state of feeling which now exists, and which it is important for us to bear in mind. For that purpose I will read an extract from a speech made by Lord Cairns in the House of Lords on the 4th of June last year, as I would rather trust his very able report on the position of affairs than any which I could myself set before you. His Lordship said :—

“I think there are in the Church of England a great number of persons, a large number of clergymen, who have no sympathy whatever with Ritualists—I use a familiar expression—or Ritualism, who have no sympathy with those extravagances and those departures from the law that have been referred to in this House, and who yet feel themselves much distressed and disquieted by the present law on the subject of the position of the minister during the time of consecration. Upon that subject there have been two decisions more or less final by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. I do not desire to say one word on the law of the question, but everyone knows how exceedingly difficult it is for any person—for any layman, perhaps for any lawyer—to be satisfied that those two decisions are reconcilable with each other. In one of those cases no defence was made, and only one side was heard. Those decisions cannot be regarded as final. If we look at the past history of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, we shall be able to find that certainly there is one case of great importance in which a decision arrived at by the Judicial Committee was afterwards altered by the same tribunal. Suppose it should hereafter be decided by the final tribunal of the country that the proper position for the minister at the time of consecration is to stand in front of the people looking towards the east. Remember, that if it should be so decided that decision will be compulsory upon every clergyman of the Church of England. Now, if that should turn out to be the law of the Church, it is a law which would press heavily upon the consciences of a great many clergymen of the Church of England. But suppose the tribunal should decide that the proper position for the clergyman is to stand looking towards the south. There are hundreds, if not thousands, of clergymen whose habit it has been all their lives, before Ritualism was thought of, certainly before it was developed, to stand in the other position. I ask your lordships to consider how a final declaration of the law to the effect that I have mentioned would bear upon the consciences of these clergymen. But suppose the court of ultimate appeal should say the rubrics are so obscure that we will leave the question of the position of the minister during the time of consecration *in dubio*:

then, after a long, difficult, and acrimonious litigation, you come to the very conclusion at which the proposal of the right rev. prelate asks your lordships to arrive."

That was the opinion of Lord Cairns, and I will now proceed to supplement it by showing that the evidence for the use of the two positions is far more nearly equal than people are apt to suppose, and that as a matter of fact there has been since the time of the Reformation this diversity of practice for the continuance of which we now contend. I may say, in passing, that the liberty I claim I wish to give to those who differ from me. I desire to assert this most emphatically. I have no wish to give liberty on the one side and to narrow it on the other. My argument, therefore, wherever it can refer to both uses, is as applicable for liberty to the one side as to the other; but as one is not challenged, it is not necessary for me to say anything on that side of the question.

Let us, then, look at the historical evidence. Of course, we all know that at the present moment both uses are widely prevalent. Of the Churches in London, we are told by competent authority that in one-sixth the priest celebrates eastward; and possibly, if we counted up the number of communicants, we should find that in the Churches where the priest celebrated eastward the numbers at all events equalled those in any like number of Churches where the minister celebrates in a different position. And what is true of London, where we can ascertain with a considerable approach to accuracy the number of Churches in which the priest celebrates looking eastward, I have no reason to believe is less true of the country taken as a whole. In some Dioceses the proportion would probably be much lower than this, whilst in others I have reason to believe that it would be larger.

I will now take as my starting-point, from which to commence proving the continuous existence up to the Reformation of the use of the eastward position, the publication of the "Tracts for the Times" in 1832. As my first example, I would state that the vicar under whom it was my great privilege to commence my ministry was

the Rev. Thos. Keble, vicar of Bisley. He was appointed to that vicarage in 1827, and he had been accustomed to celebrate eastward, with greater or less regularity, from the time of his Ordination, at which time he had seen others, and amongst them the Bishop who ordained him, adopt this rule, and he followed their example. My dear friend and colleague Canon Liddon tells me that his great-uncle, who died in 1813, at the age of fifty-six, and who had charge for many years of two parishes in Norfolk, never consecrated in any other position. I hold in my hand a letter stating that the Rev. W. Mercer, vicar of Northallerton, ever since he was ordained priest in 1821 had observed the eastward position at the time of consecration, and also that when he was a boy at Winchester it was always the use of the College Chapel. I have also a letter from Mr. Rodwell, who was in treaty with the Rev. Hugh James Rose about a curacy at Hadleigh, and one condition upon which that eminent man told this candidate for his curacy he should expect conformity was, that he should use the position which he (Mr. Rose) always did during the celebration of Holy Communion, and that was, that he should in consecrating stand facing eastward. The Rev. Thos. Symonds, vicar of Eynsham and of Stanton Harcourt, in Oxfordshire, died in 1845, after serving those parishes as curate and vicar for fifty years. Shortly before his death he said to a young friend, who had remarked upon his celebrating in front of the Altar, "This has been my unvarying custom all my life. I consider that I am obeying the rubric. I suppose many others of the clergy follow the same custom." I would call attention to the statements on this subject in the very valuable pamphlet of my friend the Rev. Morton Shaw, where amongst other instances he mentions that of Dr. Hodson, Principal of Brazenose College, Oxford (1809), and Regius Professor of Divinity (1820), who always celebrated in front.\* I have received a great number of letters containing similar evidence, with which I dare not

---

\* "The Position of the Celebrant at the Holy Communion" (2nd Edition, p. 155).

trouble the House lest I should weary its patience ; but I will venture to read one very remarkable letter from the Rev. W. Burkitt, vicar of Leeds, in Kent, a Clergyman now far advanced in years. He says :—

“ On Easter Day, 1814, Dr. Law, then Bishop of Chester, held, as he was wont to do, his Ordination in the parish church of St. James', Piccadilly, at an early hour in the morning. There was present with me in the gallery of that church one who, having been educated at Aberdeen a Presbyterian, had lived much on the Continent among Lutherans and pious Jansenists. He pointed out to me the position of the Bishop when Consecrating, which was standing 'in the midst' of the Altar, with his face eastward, and asked me whether that was the usual position of the Celebrant in the Church of England? I could not tell him, for I had never before seen a Celebration. Since that day I have been always alive to the question, and have inquired and observed carefully, and my friend became a regular worshipper in the Church of England, and as long as he lived ceased not to observe and inquire, very extensively, both in London and in the provinces, the position assumed by the Celebrant in Consecration. We did find another practice than that of the eastward position, but it was comparatively rare. And our inquiries between 1814 and 1820 confirmed the belief that the eastward was the prevailing position, and that it was very jealously preserved by many. At Oxford, between 1818 and 1822, Bishop Legge was in the habit of occasionally Confirming members of the University (no other persons being Confirmed at the same time), and of Celebrating the Holy Communion in the same service. This was at an early hour in the morning. He Consecrated using the eastward position. During the same period in some College Chapels the same position was observed. I frequently attended the service at a small village church a few miles out of Oxford, where a dear friend of the Evangelical school was incumbent. With him I was on terms of the greatest intimacy and confidence, and of him I sought an explanation of the different positions of the Celebrant. He told me the grounds on which he and Evangelical friends generally preferred Consecrating at the North End, and that he believed there was no objection to it, although, as he said, there could be no doubt as to the intention of the rubric, and the general practice of the Church at the time of the Savoy Conference and at the last revision. Yet, he said, several very high Evangelicals adhered to the words of the rubric, and two at least of that saintly band who met at 6 a.m. winter and summer to Celebrate the Holy Communion insisted upon the eastward as the proper position of the Consecrating Minister. One of those two was Romaine. But, he remarked, in the course of the preceding twenty years frequency of Celebration had increased chiefly amongst the Evangelical section ; that, in other



churches throughout the country, three or four times in a year was the usual frequency; and, therefore, the practice of the Evangelical school might almost give the rule of Celebrating. About the years 1819 and 1820 the two positions were matters of interest to certain Oxford men, and it was attempted to interest some leading men about them; but there was found to be but one opinion, and all of those by whom it was mooted were so certain that 'standing before the Table . . . and saying' could be taken in no other way than as in the Mackonochie judgment, and therefore no discussion could arise on that point. Amongst those to whom it was mentioned were Heber (who as a select preacher was often in Oxford at that time), Tyler, Cardwell, and Ellison. To Dr. Routh the Puritan objection at the Savoy Conference was mentioned (the priest 'turning his back to the people'). 'Nonsense,' said he; 'if the people's faces are all turned the same way, those in front must stand with their backs to those behind them. Our honoured Lord and Chancellor, when he read our address to the King the other day, must have turned his back to most of the heads of houses and the deputation.' In later times there must be many who remember that Bishop Maltby (who was never suspected of Sacerdotalism) began the Communion Service standing at the north-west angle of the Altar, and Consecrated 'in the midst,' with his face to the east. This I had observed in the diocese of Chichester; and, in 1841, being on a visit to the then incumbent of Bishop Auckland, I mentioned the circumstance, and he said that the eastward position was, he thought, the usual one. Between 1841 and 1843 I assisted many clergymen in different parts of the country, and observed—what I could not have seen but at the Altar—that, with few exceptions, the eastward position was adhered to; and amongst those who used it, I might mention two eminent Evangelical men—one, the excellent late Rector of All Saints', Hastings. In this case, as in all unrestored churches, the high pews effectually prevented devout communicants from knowing where and how the Consecrating priest stood. A venerated friend, on reading the foregoing part of this letter, seemed to take umbrage at what I have said of the influence which the Evangelical revival may have had on the orthodox practice, which had certainly prevailed previously—that that revival had found only three or four Celebrations in a year, even in large parishes, and that it stirred up many hundreds to Celebrate at least monthly; and that it was not unlikely that Evangelical men scattered up and down the land, and most of them preferring to Consecrate at the North End, led others to do so, who otherwise would have followed the orthodox practice. But this is the more probable when it is remembered that Newman and others, who afterwards became leaders in the subsequent Catholic revival, found, for some years, few with whom they could sympathize but the Evangelical men; and how, on the other hand, many high and dry were awakened to spiritual religion, so as partially to combine

even with Calvinists; and how, again, when once the idea of Sacerdotalism was in any degree associated with the orthodox eastward position, that idea, as we now see, would run like wildfire, and a preference would be given to what would seem the safer practice."

I will not trouble the House with further details, except as to one modern case—that of a man with whose name we all used to be familiar, but which, unhappily, owing to bodily infirmity, is less frequently before the Church than it was formerly—that of the Rev. F. E. Paget, vicar of Elford. Mr. Paget says that for the last forty years he has always celebrated in his present parish eastward; that his predecessor for forty-two years previously, and his predecessor also for forty-two years, did the same. That covers 124 years, and virtually carries us back to 1750. Continuing my catena, and turning to a few years earlier, we have in a book published in 1717, on "The Whole Duty of Receiving Worthily the Blessed Sacrament," a picture showing a place for the book in the centre of the table, and therefore necessarily requiring the Priest to stand "before the table." Then in Scandret's "Sacrifice the Divine Service," published in 1707, we find the following:—

"In fine, since I have been so bold, I will proceed a little further yet, and recommend to my brethren, the inferior priests, the observation of the Rubric in that particular of standing before the Altar when they offer up this tremendous oblation, the Eucharistical or peace offering of the New Law, whereby they will be put in mind not to perform the manual ceremonies carelessly or clandestinely, as some too usually do. Not that I believe the place of standing at the Altar to be more than a circumstance; but, besides our obedience to the Church, and the ancient practice thereof, we shall by this peculiar posture specify and distinguish that great action of worship in the Christian Temple, and recommend it, as so, to the notice and observation of the Congregation" (p. 64).

In 1704, I have, in a frontispiece to a little "Book of Prayers used by the late King William III.," a representation of John Moore, Bishop of Norwich, standing before the Altar, but turning half round to address the King. I have also the frontispiece of another book, dated 1700,

called "Divine Banquet of Sacramental Devotions," from which it is clear that the Priest celebrated eastward. I have also a photograph of a picture of the apse of St. Paul's drawn in 1698, in which on the table are two cushions with open books upon them, placed so that one of the officiating priests must have stood at what is called the *dextrum cornu*, and the other at the *sinistrum cornu*. I have also a picture in Sparrow's "Rationale of the Book of Common Prayer," published in 1672, which seems to point to the officiating minister using the Eastward position. We then come to the age of Jeremy Taylor and Bishop Cosin. Of their practice I need say nothing: their writings tell it too plainly. Laud and Wren certainly celebrated facing eastward. When tried for their lives they made excuses; but the fact of their celebrating eastward cannot be doubted. Ascending a little higher up the stream of time we come to the early days of Elizabeth. When Queen Mary succeeded her brother she turned out 1,800 ministers of the Church of England, and filled their places with Clergymen who more sympathised with her own views. When Elizabeth came to the throne only 177 of the survivors of these 1,800 Clergymen thought it necessary to give up their benefices—the remainder continued in the Church of England, and conformed to the reformed Liturgy as reintroduced by Queen Elizabeth. We know that at that period discipline was lax: in the agitated state of the country it was impossible to insist upon strict obedience to the rubrics. We may, therefore, fairly assume that Clergymen celebrated in the manner to which they were accustomed, and as to what that must have been in the reign of Queen Mary there can be no doubt. We know that with regard to surplices and vestments there was the greatest carelessness. Two parties stood face to face—the same two parties which still exist—and when discipline was lax we may not unfairly assume that each party followed the uses to which it was attached. The Puritans began to gather strength, and sought to innovate by destroying whatever they could of those rites and cere-

monial practices which connected the then existing Church in England with the same Church previous to the Reformation ; the other side adhered pertinaciously to what they had been accustomed, and were anxious to preserve in its integrity the idea of the continuity of the English Church. In the First Prayer Book of Edward VI. it was ordered that the Priest should face eastward. We may, therefore, assume that those who grew up under the teaching of this book, and during the previous period, continued to practise the customs to which they were habituated. Of course, after such a great lapse of time, in cases of this description, it is difficult to prove what was the general practice, as the records of what was then done are necessarily few. Therefore, to find so much evidence from the present time up to the Reformation as I have been able to place before the House certainly establishes the fact that the liberty for which we now contend has been enjoyed by this Church of England ever since the Reformation.

I cannot, therefore, imagine how the seven remonstrants, in the face of such facts as those to which I have called the attention of the House, can venture to say, "It is contrary to the all but universal usage of the Church of England during more than 200 years." Those who sympathized with the Puritan view of this subject swept away many old customs ; and when these customs are restored, such restoration will appear to the next generation to be new practices. I think, then, I have shown that the use of the eastward position was, in fact, a practice, I might say a widely prevalent practice, of this Church of England previous to this century ; and I object that it is unreasonable to enforce a custom brought in by one generation to the exclusion of an alternative custom which had been largely in use by a great body of the Clergy ever since the Reformation. That would be a great hardship.

But it is objected that the rubric, though possibly admitting the eastward position, did so as a mere matter of convenience, and only permitted it because it was used

without doctrinal significance. Opponents of the liberty for which I am now contending say the whole question is now changed because it is asserted to have such significance, and that the doctrine which it is held to typify is one not admissible within the communion of the Church of England. Before examining this point there is one argument against limiting this time-honoured liberty of the Church of England on this ground to which I must call your attention. The English Reformers—I distinguish them from the foreign Reformers who so much influenced the revision of our Prayer Book in 1552—the old English Reformers ordered that “the priest should stand humbly afore the midst of the Altar,” and, therefore, to say that that is a Romish position is to cast a great slur and reproach upon the very men to whom we are indebted for breaking away from the superstitions of the Church of Rome. I am as opposed as any man can be to bringing into our Church anything Romish; but, on the other hand, I am anxious not to surrender one single Catholic practice which has been so far retained in the Church of England. But there is another authority on this subject to which I will now appeal, and it is one that ought to have great weight with some in this House, with those who are apt to quote its conclusions as of irrefragable authority. I mean the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. The case to which I refer is that of “*Sheppard v. Bennett*.” The doctrine challenged was that of the Eucharist being in any sense a Sacrifice. In considering this point it is necessary for us to remember that there are some few persons so ignorant of theology, or so blinded by partisan antipathies, as not to be able to understand how the word Sacrifice can be used in the sense in which it is employed by great ecclesiastical writers; and they have ventured to say that those who employ it do so with the feeling that in the Holy Communion there is intended a repetition of the One Awful Sacrifice on Calvary. I deeply regret that such an unfounded charge should ever have been made, for I well know how entirely the accusation

is contradicted by facts, how absolutely unsupported it is by the writings of those against whom it is levelled. That the Church has not defined any particular doctrine of Sacrifice is certain, but that she holds a doctrine of Sacrifice is equally certain. It is set before us in the very earliest teaching which she places in our hands. For in her Catechism she says that the Holy Communion is for "the continual remembrance of the Sacrifice of the Death of Christ and of the benefits which we receive thereby." What does she mean by the words "continual remembrance"? Who is to be put in remembrance? Surely not those who are about to receive the Blessed Sacrament? On the one hand, it cannot be imagined that at the time when the communicants are assembled to "shew the Lord's Death"\* they need to be put in remembrance that it actually happened; and, on the other, it cannot be supposed that to be present at the Holy Communion necessarily puts us forcibly in mind of the all-Atoning Death of our Blessed Lord, or at all events not more so than would a picture or the eloquent words of a preacher. The remembrance referred to in the Catechism cannot be by man: what is meant by the expression obviously is and must be a Memorial presented before the Eternal Father to plead the merits of the all-Atoning Sacrifice of His Incarnate Son on our behalf. But let me turn to the judgment of the Privy Council in the case of "Sheppard v. Bennett" on this point. It first quotes a passage from Bishop Bull on the subject of Sacrifice, and thus shows clearly that at all events one view of the doctrine of Sacrifice is not only permissible within the limits of the Church of England, but that it is positively accepted and approved by her Supreme Court of Judicature.† Bishop Bull says:—

"In the Eucharist, then, Christ is Offered, not Hypostatically, as the Trent fathers have determined, for so He was but once

*x. 8. I have thought that this was one of the meanings of continual. This is not the sense of one.*

\* 1 Cor. xi. 26.

† The Argument by A. J. Stephens before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, in the case of Sheppard v. Bennett, with their Lordships' Judgment, p. 298.

Offered, but commemoratively only; and this commemoration is made to God the Father, and is not a bare remembering or putting ourselves in mind of Him. For every Sacrifice is directed to God, and the oblation therein made, whatsoever it be, hath Him for its object, and not man. In the Holy Eucharist, therefore, we set before God the bread and wine, 'as figures or images of the precious Blood of Christ, shed for us, and of His precious Body' (they are the very words of the Clementine Liturgy), and plead to God the Merit of His Son's Sacrifice once offered on the Cross for us sinners, and in this Sacrament represented, beseeching Him for the sake thereof to bestow His heavenly blessings on us" (*Bull's Works*, Vol. II., p. 22).

The judgment then proceeds to say :\*—

"The distinction between an act by which a satisfaction for sin is made, and a devotional rite by which the satisfaction so made is represented and pleaded before God, is clear, though it is liable to be obscured, not only in the apprehension of the ignorant, but by the tendency of theologians to exalt the importance of the rite till the distinction itself well nigh disappears. To apply the word sacrifice in the sense in which Bishop Bull has used it to the ordinance of the Lord's Supper, though it may be liable to abuse and misapprehension, does not appear to be a contravention of any proposition legitimately deducible from the Thirty-ninth Article. It is not clear to their lordships that the Respondent has so used the word 'sacrifice' as to contradict the language of the Articles."

We have, therefore, a distinct acceptance of the doctrine of Sacrifice, so far as it is held by the great majority of the Clergymen who use the Eastward Position, pronounced by the Court of Final Appeal. With regard, then, to use and to doctrine, there is no reason whatever for narrowing the practice of the Church of England—no reason whatever for setting up a new rule—a rule before unknown in the Church of England. Nay, I am wrong there—it was once set up, but they who did it brought Archbishop Laud and King Charles to the block, and destroyed, as far as man could destroy, the Church of England. I have, I think, given sufficient reason why this House should recommend the preservation of that liberty with regard to the Eastward Position which the Committee, in the resolution I am proposing, desires to have secured.

---

\* *Ibid.* p. 299.

But there are other objections which I must consider. The seven objectionists say, in their fourth ground for protesting :—

“ Because it seems to us that two distinct practices so explicitly defined and authorized necessarily imply the formal recognition of two diverse doctrines ; an anomaly altogether different from the comprehension under one and the same rule of persons who, while differing from one another in many respects, are content to remain under such rule.”

And they then add, as their fifth reason for objecting to the report :—

“ We would have agreed to proceed further than the Report does, and to recommend a liberty which would have left the position of the Minister at the Table entirely free, while at the same time making it clear beyond doubt or question that the Church does not attach any doctrinal significance whatever to this position.”

That is, in order to secure uniformity, instead of two the seven dissentients think it desirable to permit thirty-two positions—one for every point of the compass. Further, is this quite a fair argument in the mouth of those who see a great danger of attaching doctrinal significance to a ceremonial Rite? Would not there be more danger of attaching undue significance to it if there were only one use? To insist on absolute uniformity is Popery indeed! Are not all who submit to Rome likely to attach exaggerated importance to the one position such as that Church would enforce from the very fact of one only use being ever allowed? If you insist on absolute uniformity, never to be disturbed by allowing option of any kind, in what position shall we be then placed but that of having ruined one party or the other against whichever the judgment may be pronounced and enforced?

But there is another point. If this absolute uniformity of practice is so very important, how about the Gorham judgment? Did not that permit a diversity of faith of far greater importance than any diversity of practice which the liberty now contended for could originate? Are you prepared to say you will make only one new groove instead of the old traditions and reasonable liberty of the Church



of England? That is to say, are you prepared to insist that every man must utter a Shibboleth only in your way? If you think that by doing this, with respect to the matters brought before us in the report we are now considering, peace and quietness will be secured, I venture to assure you that you are much mistaken. The first yielding to clamour for an abridgment of existing liberties in the Church would speedily be followed by far more extended demands—demands which perhaps have not as yet been fully realised by some members of this House. I will venture to show by an illustration how far some, before the victory to which they look forward is won, are already prepared to advance. The Rev. Arthur Wolfe, Rector of Fornham All Saints', near Bury St. Edmund's, and late Fellow and Tutor of Clare College, Cambridge, has published a pamphlet, in which he lets us know what is the cure he recommends for the present evils, and his idea is substantially endorsed by a newspaper which is supposed to be the organ of the party which is assailing that liberty for which we are now contending—I mean the *Record*. Mr. Wolfe says : \*—

“The removal of the ‘Prayer of Consecration’ altogether would cut at the roots of such superstitious notions far better than any argument, especially if at the same time the Rubric were removed which requires the people to receive *kneeling*. If Evangelical ministers in addition would preach more frequently the *Real Absence*, pointing out that we show forth Christ's death *till He come*, so that as soon as ever He is again bodily present the Sacrament is at an end,—we should be less likely to have such notions among us about a ‘Real Presence’ as we have at present.”

He is a reformer of the advanced type—when he begins he would make an end, for he adds : †—

“If, on getting removed from our Communion Office the ‘prayer of consecration’ we could also get removed the corresponding prayer in the Baptismal Office, in which the priest prays God to ‘sanctify’ the water, we should have a better chance of being free from much of the superstition connected with the other Sacrament of Christ's institution.”

---

\* “A few Words about the Eastward Position of the Officiating Minister,” p. 4.

† *Ibid.* p. 5.

I would ask this House if it is prepared to take the first step in narrowing the liberty of the Church of England in the way proposed, with the ultimate design of reaching the goal set before them by Mr. Wolfe?

Then some objecters against the liberty for which I plead say that in such an unimportant matter all ought to be made to conform. But the previous objection is, that it is so important. It is clear that both these contradictory objections cannot stand. They are mutually destructive. But, if it is so important, who has made it so? If the present interest in it is a factitious interest, when that ceases, as cease it must if it be so, the interest in it will die, and it will cease to be regarded as of importance in the Church of England. Accidental party feeling may magnify unimportant questions, and invest them with a dignity to which they have no claim; but it is certain that such cases may safely be left to time, which will manifest their due proportions, and that their only chance of becoming permanently matters of interest is by stepping out of our way, and interfering with them by seeking to put them down by persecution or other violent means. But I do not see how this objection of unduly magnifying the importance of this question can be urged by those who have been attaching such marvellous power to the Eastward Position as symbolizing doctrine. Do remember that that importance has largely arisen from the arguments of our opponents. We have said little or nothing about the connection between the position and doctrine, except when we have been forced to speak; the public hear far more about the doctrinal argument from the mouths of opponents than from those of supporters. Under such circumstances, it having been made to symbolize doctrine, to surrender the Eastward Position would, in the eyes of many, be to surrender the doctrine of Sacrifice, although approved by the Church.

Whilst considering this part of our subject it is well for us to remember that faith is not one of those plants which having been once placed in the minds of men are certain always to grow and to flourish. It is with some

easily blighted and rendered unfruitful. It may be said, what effect can so small a matter as this have on the minds of men educated in the faith—is men's faith to be shaken because they see the Priest's position altered from one side of the Holy Table to another? A remarkable illustration of the effect of such a change has lately occurred. St. Mary's, Soho, is in the centre of one of the poorest neighbourhoods in London, it is close to the Seven Dials; owing to the persevering, self-denying exertions of the late Incumbent, that Church was filled with the poor in a remarkable manner. Mr. Chambers used the Eastward Position and other ritual observances. He died, and a Clergyman of different views came in his place. What was the result? The late churchwardens tell us in a paper which has, I believe, been placed in the hands of every member of this House:—

“The consequence of this has been that the members of the old congregation of St. Mary's, which was, in the main, composed of poor people from the slums comprising the district parish, have ceased to attend the church, and go elsewhere, at much personal inconvenience, for the religious privileges which they had learnt to value, but of which you have deprived them. In proof of this we may cite the numbers in St. Mary's Church last Sunday (Easter Day). Not counting official persons and school children, there were exactly fourteen people present at the beginning of the eleven o'clock service. In former years, as all those who have frequented St. Mary's Church know well, the building has on Easter Day been so densely crowded at this service that many late comers have been unable to obtain admission, not to say standing room.”

We are told that they have left the Church where they had been trained to worship and gone to others. I fear that our knowledge of mankind must lead us all to fear that some have been dropped by the way, that some who were acquiring a loving interest in spiritual things have lost that interest, and have ceased to attend Church altogether; that the uprooting of that to which they were becoming attached at St. Mary's has been followed by what will prove the uprooting of faith from their hearts. Do remember that there are a considerable number of persons who are led to look up into heaven for the truths they hold, and who think but little of the media through which they see those

truths, so long as all proceeds in the manner to which they have been accustomed ; so long as they trust those who instruct them, their faith remains firm and unshaken. But when their teachers are discredited, their instructions overturned, everything questioned which they had assumed to be good and lawful, their faith is apt to be shaken ; it is the heavens reflected in the sea on which they then appear to look, and everything will seem turned topsy-turvy, faith will be lost, and those who had grasped the truth will be found to have fallen back into the wretchedness of impure and sinful living. I feel that, in the interests of the poor, this is a matter of great importance.

But it may be said, why should the position of the Celebrant be important when you can preach the doctrine? True, we can. The Bennett judgment has settled that. We may preach every Sunday about the doctrine, and little else, and what will be the effect? We may say from the pulpit that the proper position for the Celebrant is before the Holy Table looking eastward, but the decisions of the law courts hinder us from standing there. And then uneducated or partially educated people will ask, "Did Clergymen do this before?" Yes, always, until a new besom of reform swept over the Church of England, when we got rid of so much of the old Liturgy in order to make her more like a Calvinistic sect. Would that satisfy enquirers? Moreover I believe that if we so preached the doctrine of Sacrifice whilst abandoning the ritual by which it has been popularly held to be expressed, we should be doing much to destroy that old straightforward truthfulness which has long been a distinguishing characteristic of earnest religious Churchpeople; and the result would be that irritation would be perpetually fostered, a sense of wrong and injustice would be ever working in men's minds, and be spreading its baneful influence more and more widely. Great evils, then, will undoubtedly arise if we are not to express by ritual hitherto allowed unchallenged in our Churches what none can interfere with our continuing to teach the people from our pulpits. Surely, then, we have here another reason

why we ought not to sweep away this long-enjoyed liberty.

It is quite clear that such reasons as those to which I have referred are insufficient to account for this new crusade against the liberty of the Church of England. There is nothing in any or in all of them to account for the virulence with which this raid upon our liberties is conducted out of doors. I do not charge anyone in this House with ulterior motives. I believe we all wish to promote the prosperity of the Church of England by doing what we think we have a right to do; but there is an extreme party outside that wishes to push out people whose doctrine it does not like. We have heard that the party aimed at is that of the extreme Ritualists. It seems to me, if we judge people's intentions by their actions, that it is not the Ritualists who are really aimed at; but that their name is used whilst it is hoped that others will be hit. For it may be well for us to remember that that party may be far less affected by the proposed restrictions than moderate High Churchmen will be. Extreme men will find other modes of teaching doctrine which more moderate men could not adopt. Suppose you were to forbid the Eastward Position, and Clergymen holding very high sacramental opinions were to tell their congregations that it would make practically little matter if the same doctrine was clearly brought out in some other way, and that this could be most effectually accomplished by all prostrating themselves to the earth, so that there should be no doubt about its being an act of adoration, during the consecration prayer, there is no law in the Church to prevent it. You cannot interfere with the liberty of lay people. To banish the Eastward Position, and to have instead the general prostration of the lay people, would be regarded, I imagine, as a gain by few even of the most heated partisans. You may say, but we could hinder a Clergyman from giving such advice in Church, and so we need not fear that. I doubt whether you could do so, but even supposing that you could so far interfere as to forbid the giving such advice from the pulpit, you could not hinder its being given

in the schoolroom. We are told by some of their own organs that the extreme party will conform to the decree of the Court whatever it may be, and remain in the Church, but at the same time labour to their utmost for its disestablishment. But moderate men, of whom I hope I am one, cannot accept that course. Our honesty of purpose, our sense of what is required from us as truth-loving Englishmen, as well as our zeal for the Church we love, hinder us from taking such a course. It therefore follows that the party really hit at are the moderate High Churchmen.

I should like to call the attention of the House to what the country owes to High Churchmen. That party has been the bone and sinew of the Church, without which, in my opinion, she would have perished. In the Caroline period the great men whose names are ever quoted as the great ornaments of the Church universally belonged to that school: it was they who endeavoured to stop the action of the Puritans in the time of the first Charles, and who built up the Church in the days of his son; and it is by them that in later times the Church has been greatly served, and in my opinion practically saved. The Evangelical revival took place a good many years earlier than the so-called Catholic revival. It certainly began before the end of the last century, and we may fairly say that it was in a position to put forth its full force at the commencement of this century. Let us try what it did for the Church of England, then, in those years when it was in the ascendent, when it represented the active religious energy in the Church. The greatest institution it brought into being was the Church Missionary Society, the benefits of which have been felt all over the world. Its large income shows that it must have been supported by a powerful and wealthy section of the Church. It was founded in 1799. The Bible Society was founded a few years earlier. If we take the first thirty-five years of the present century, and compare them with the last thirty-five years, we have therein a means of comparison between what has been accomplished by the two great parties in the Church.

But remember that this comparison is not on quite equal terms. The Evangelical party had reached its maturity in 1801, the year from which we start; the activity of the High Church party only commenced in September, 1833, with the issue of the first number of "Tracts for the Times." In 1836, therefore, it had not gained its full vigour. But however, notwithstanding this disadvantage, let us make the comparison. Let us take as our first point of comparison the number of new Churches consecrated. These were as follows:—1801 to 1810, 43; 1811 to 1820, 96; 1821 to 1830, 308; 1831 to 1840, 600; 1841 to 1850, 929; 1851 to 1860, 820; 1861 to 1870, 1,110. In other words, from 1801 to 1835 there were 640 Churches consecrated, and from 1836 to 1870 no fewer than 3,257. But our comparison would be very incomplete if we stopped here. The impetus to Church building during the earlier period was given by a power which was all but unknown during the second. For in the earlier period, 1801 to 1835, the motive power was two Parliamentary grants—one of a million and the other of about half a million; and in the last thirty-five years nothing has been derived from the public funds for Church building. But it may be said that in the latter period the population had largely increased; that there was greater need for new Churches; that men were pushed on to make efforts to supply spiritual destitution which was not to be found during the earlier years of the century. That argument, however, when fairly examined, really tells, in my opinion, the other way. The tide of great manufacturing and commercial activity set in towards the end of the last century. Men began to cluster round new manufactories, and to form large towns, long before 1836. Hamlets became villages; parishes which had largely consisted of waste lands, or of land used for agricultural purposes, found themselves almost suddenly peopled with a multitude of inhabitants, and there were no churches for them. Until the first Parliamentary grant there was but one parish Church for Lambeth, though it extended from the Thames to what is now the Crystal Palace; whilst for the large district

lying on the other side of the hill, between the Crystal Palace and Lewisham, there was but one other Church. And this is but a specimen of what was to be found in many places. For it was during the later years of last century and the earlier ones of this that the foundations of our towns were laid; they became populous then, they have only become more populous since. There must, therefore, have been far more need of new Churches then than now, when although the mass of population is so great, there is no one person who wishes to do so who cannot go to Church. The Church in the first thirty-five years, therefore, in the matter of Church building, did very little; whilst in the latter thirty-five years she did a great deal. But it may be said, during the period of which you are speaking the feeling of the country was against private persons expending their money on Church building. This is no argument. Churchmen and Nonconformists are Englishmen alike, and if Churchmen during those thirty-five years did but little to increase the number of Churches, Nonconformists did very much to add to the number of Dissenting chapels. What zeal and devotion accomplished on the one side might have been effected on the other, and any legal difficulties which existed might have been swept away by men resolved to succeed. They were swept away so soon as Churchmen roused themselves to be in earnest upon the subject. But, whilst saying this, let it not be supposed that I undervalue the efforts put forth during the later period by the Evangelical section of the Church. I gladly recognise the work they have done, and the self-sacrificing liberality which many of them have exhibited in building Churches, and in the performance of other good works. What I claim is that the greater impetus of the latter period came distinctly from the High Church party, and that this began to be felt after the Oxford Tracts made their appearance. I do not undervalue what the Evangelical party has since accomplished, but it was not by them that the new force was introduced which exhibited itself in Church building.



Having seen what was wrought by the Church, let us next examine what was done by Dissenters during those periods. Listen to the figures :—

|                             | 1812.*    | 1851.*    | 1872.† |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-----------|--------|
| Independent (“churches”)... | 1,024 ... | 3,244 ... | 2,880  |

I ought to say, with respect to these figures, that the number of Independent churches in 1851 is taken from the religious census tables of 1851; whilst that for 1872 is taken from a handbook of the body, which may possibly not include some sections that are included in the other census. Compare the growth between 1812 and 1851, when the Evangelical party was in the ascendant, and between 1851 and 1872, when the influence of the High Church party had made itself felt. In the one case the body was multiplied three times, whilst during the later period a positive decrease is shown; and, even if this should be found to arise from incompleteness in the statistics, arising from the cause just mentioned, it is certain that there is no extensive growth to chronicle.

Let us next turn to the

|                               | 1790.‡  | 1851.§    | 1875. |
|-------------------------------|---------|-----------|-------|
| Baptists (congregations)..... | 313 ... | 2,789 ... | 3,191 |

I am obliged to take as my basis of comparison “Churches,” “Congregations,” or “Members,” not as I would, but as I am able to find them in the earlier authorities from which I quote, and these are chiefly the “religious census” returns of 1851, and books published by the several denominations. Here, too, make a like comparison of the power of the two systems in opposing

\* Census, 1851. Religious Worship, p. 19.

† “Congregational Year-Book,” 1873. It ought to be added that there are 702 more Independent “churches” in Scotland, the Channel Islands, and the Colonies; but as the Census report of 1851 expressly says, “The present Census makes the number 3,244 (2,604 in England, and 640 in Wales),” it is obvious that these ought to be excluded in making a comparison.

‡ “Baptist Annual Register,” 1790.

§ Census, 1851. Religious Worship, p. 21

|| “Baptist Hand-Book” for 1875, p. 269.

the growth of this class of Dissenters. In the sixty-one years included in the earlier period the Baptists added nearly 900 per cent. to their numbers; in the later twenty-four years not 15 per cent. At the beginning of the century prose-lytes must have been largely gathered in from other sections of the people. During the last quarter of a century they can scarcely have retained in their fold all that were descended from members of their communion. Let us next turn to the most powerful of the Nonconforming communities — the different denominations of Methodists. Here we have the following figures:—

|                           |         |           |         |           |         |
|---------------------------|---------|-----------|---------|-----------|---------|
|                           |         |           | 1851.*  |           | 1874.†  |
| Wesleyans (sittings)..... |         | 1,447,580 | ...     | 1,664,975 |         |
|                           | 1828.‡  | 1841.‡    | 1851.‡  | 1871.‡    | 1874.‡  |
| Wesleyans }<br>(members)  | 245,194 | 328,792   | 302,207 | 347,090   | 351,645 |

The figures here are very curious and instructive. Between 1828 and 1841 this body added 83,598 to the number of its members, or at the rate of more than 6,400 a-year. During the last three years there has been a growth of only 5,455 members, or little more than 1,800 a-year, so that it is clear many children of Wesleyan parents must have deserted that body, as the increase is far from representing what it would have been had all continued with them who were born in their communion. And yet, whilst the additions to the number of their members have been so small, chapel building has advanced at a rate which shows how much wealth and willingness to give it must exist amongst them. I forbear to comment on the figures during the intervening periods, because I believe they were largely affected by a schism in the Connexion. To the statistics of some of these bodies separated from the original organization founded by John Wesley I next draw your attention, but on them I need make no comment.

\* Census, 1851. Religious Worship, p. 29.

† The "Wesleyan Methodist Connexional Record and Year-Book," 1874, p. 110.

‡ Minutes of Wesleyan Conference.

|                                     |        |         |         |
|-------------------------------------|--------|---------|---------|
|                                     | 1853.* |         | 1874.†  |
| New Connexion Methodists (chapels)  | 301    | ...     | 416     |
| ditto ditto (members)               | 21,384 | ...     | 21,955  |
|                                     | 1820.‡ | 1850.‡  | 1874.§  |
| Primitive Methodists (members)...   | 7,842  | 104,762 | 164,660 |
|                                     | 1860.  |         | 1874.   |
| Wesleyan Reform Union (members) ... | 12,516 | ...     | 7,581   |

Thus it will be seen how rapidly Nonconformity spread when there was no school in the Church but the Evangelical to hinder its progress: how comparatively slowly it has since increased. And when we remember that during the later period there was to be expected a natural growth arising from the children of members, whilst in the earlier one all additions must have been drawn from the external world or from members of other communions, most probably from the Church, the contrast becomes still more striking. In short, during the first thirty-five years the Evangelical party were impotent to stop the spread of Dissent throughout the country; Nonconformity advanced with rapid strides, and it was only when the Catholic party came to the rescue that the Church of England was enabled to resume its supremacy.

That this is being accomplished I imagine all candid persons must admit. The Church has now a spiritual power which she was not seen to possess some years since. The Church is now a political force in a very different sense to what she was at a period which most of us can remember. She has renewed her strength in a manner which must surprise all of us who reflect upon the past and compare it with the present. Remember, then, that all this has been done under the wholesome liberty which the Church has hitherto allowed to her children; but now if that liberty is to be contracted, depend upon it that the

---

\* Census, 1851. Religious Worship, p. 31.

† "Methodist New Connexion Hand-Book," 1874.

‡ Census, 1851. Religious Worship, p. 32.

§ Primitive Methodist Minutes of Conference, 1874.

|| Minutes of the Annual Delegate Meeting of the Wesleyan Reform Union.

rapid advances made by the Church in these later days will be stopped, and I fear a retrograde period will again be witnessed. Supposing an interpretation to be put upon this rubric which would limit the liberty hitherto enjoyed in the Church of England, the result upon many of those who have done good service in her cause would be disastrous. It would chill their ardour and damp their energies. They would feel that their services had been repaid with injuries, their devotion with slights; and that they were bidden to cease to labour by the mother whom they loved so well. The lesson which we heard this morning must recal to the minds of those who heard them Dr. Newman's last public words in the communion of the Church of England, in which he touchingly describes what were then his feelings, and what would certainly be those of the men of whom I have been speaking if you deprive them of the liberty for which I am now pleading. He referred to Orpah embracing her mother and leaving her and Ruth clinging to her, and then after some little interval he exclaimed:—

“O my mother, whence is this unto thee, that thou hast good things poured upon thee and canst not keep them, and bearest children, yet darest not own them? Why hast thou not the skill to use their services, nor the heart to rejoice in their love? how is it that whatever is generous in purpose, and tender or deep in devotion, thy flower and thy promise, falls from thy bosom, and finds no home within thine arms? Who hath put this note upon thee, to have ‘a miscarrying womb and dry breasts,’ to be strange to thine own flesh, and thine eye cruel to thy little ones? Thine own offspring, the fruit of thy womb, who love thee and would toil for thee, thou dost gaze upon with fear, as though a portent, or thou dost loath as an offence; at best thou dost but endure, as if they had no claim but on thy patience, self-possession, and vigilance, to be rid of them as easily as thou mayest. Thou makest them ‘stand all the day idle’ as the very condition of thy bearing with them; or thou biddest them begone where they will be more welcome; or thou sellest them for nought to the stranger that passes by. And what wilt thou do in the end thereof?”\*

I would ask you to look a little further. What was the result of the unhappy proceedings against that great man?

---

\* “Sermons on Subjects of the Day,” pp. 461, 462.

What has been the effect of them upon the University of Oxford? What Oxford was before Dr. Newman was driven out of the Church of England by a course of action not unlike that to which many are eager to urge you against the High Churchmen of the present day we may learn from the following eloquent words of Mr. Shairp, the accomplished Principal of St. Andrew's, and a Presbyterian :—

“There was not a reading man at least at Oxford who was not more or less indirectly influenced by it. Only the very idle or the very frivolous were wholly proof against it. On all others it impressed a sobriety of conduct and a seriousness not usually found among large bodies of young men. It raised the tone of average morality in Oxford to a level which, perhaps, it had never before reached. You may call it over-wrought and too highly strung. Perhaps it was. It is better, however, for young men to be so than to be doubters or cynics.”\*

Dr. Newman was swept away by the action of the Church of that day; and what do we find now at Oxford? “Is there a God?” is a question now hotly disputed in that University; and I am afraid some of her more learned sons would answer in the negative. It is, then, for you to consider whether you will follow the example, and remember it is more than possible that the result may be the same.

But let us look this point more closely in the face; let us consider what would be the probable consequence of insisting upon an absolute uniformity in the position of the Celebrant at the Holy Table. If you should abridge this liberty the effect would probably be twofold. It would influence men in one of two ways. It would either make High Churchmen feel that their labours are so despised and their principles so disliked that the best thing they can do is to hide their sorrow in retirement. They would not enter a foreign Communion—that has providentially been rendered impossible for them now! But they would feel that their occupation was gone; that there was no spirit left in them to make ventures for the spread

---

\* “John Keble,” by J. C. Shairp, p. 8.

of religion or the conversion of souls. Think of the character and weight and influence of many of those whom this controversy affects. They are not light, young, heady men, possessed of no power or authority in the Church ; but many of them are men who have spent their lives in her service : men whose names are known throughout the whole Anglican Communion ; men of whose words and deeds you are proud ; men who have to a great extent sacrificed all earthly prospects in order to teach and to forward the religious interests of the Church of England. If you so narrow the ancient liberties of this Church of England as to forbid a ceremonial practice because it symbolizes a doctrine which they hold and which they have taught, and which the Final Court of Appeal has pronounced to be in strict conformity with the formularies of our Church, the men of whom I am speaking will feel compelled to be silent. They will be unable to say what they have previously said, to appear to deny what they continue to believe to be true, to seem to question the rightfulness of what they have previously done, by adopting a use which they had previously argued against. They could not bear to see the scandal and the evil to the souls they have loved, and the poor amongst whom they have incessantly laboured breaking away from Christ, and settling again into the sinful habits from which they now seem to be rescued. Even in retirement their hearts would be grieved to see their work undone, not by enemies, but by so-called friends. And while many would endeavour to gain quiet and peace in private life by giving up their positions of honour and usefulness, and in some, possibly in many, cases by leaving their cures and their homes for poverty and privation, what must be the future of the Church of England ? How would it be affected by their action ? The great party with which these men have always acted must go to pieces. It could not go on long without heart, without spirit, with depressed feelings, and a sense of having been ill and hardly used, when those who ought to

have esteemed them highly for the work's sake had cast them out. By such a course of action the moderate High Church party must be destroyed. This would be the effect upon some, but a different course would have greater attraction for others. The many who would probably remain at work in the Church would become extreme; all young men whose sympathies were with them would naturally take the same line. You would have two extreme parties facing each other, with no moderate party to unite them, or to make peace between them possible. When such a state of things shall have been reached, it needs no prophet to foretell the end. It would make small matter which party was victorious, for in no case could the existing status of the Church continue. And it may be less certain than some may think which party would be victors; for enthusiasm generally prevails, and there can be little doubt as to which side has the largest amount of enthusiasm.

Surely, with the possibility of such consequences before us, this House will never be a party to taking away that liberty which we have had in the past. We are Christian men battling for what we deem our rights; we ought, therefore, to contend in a spirit of love. But it is not a spirit of love which would cast out men with whom on many points we agree. It is not a spirit of love when we call in the secular arm to repress and expel, and refuse to permit the continued existence of a liberty which has never been denied hitherto to members of our Church. It is not by persecution that we should seek to make our principles prevail, but by practically proving the living force of what we profess and believe by our devotion to the cause of the Great Master. Do not let us waste our strength in warring against and devouring one another; but, instead of this, let us all work for God—let us all see how we can best serve His Church—let us not strive to turn each other out of a work in which both are doing good—let us not in our eagerness for a party triumph forget that these disputes involve tremendous consequences to what-

ever side the decision of the Court may be adverse—and let us by all means shrink from doing anything to narrow our fair and ancient liberty.

Remember, too, what would be the effect of the line of action which I deprecate on those outside. We are not a nation in which faith is deeply rooted. It is continually coming to the surface that there are large bodies of men with only half faith, and with whom are such persons likely to sympathise should the catastrophe happen which I am seeking to make you realize? We have very recently had two remarkable instances of the effect upon the people of this country of what has seemed to them persecution. Dr. Kenealy has been returned as Member of Parliament for Stoke-on-Trent, and why? Because it was felt, rightly or otherwise I do not say, by the working men that he had been wronged, and they elected him, as they thought, as a protest in favour of justice and fair dealing. Then look at the Shakers in the New Forest, what an amount of sympathy they have had from persons who did not in the least agree with them; and the only reason we can give for this is that it was felt they were hardly and improperly treated. And if Dr. Kenealy and the Shakers gained so large an amount of public sympathy, will none be given by the people of England to a large and exemplary body of the Clergy—men who have been the leaders in every good work, earnest and self-devoted, the friends of the poor and the distressed—when such men are turned out of their livings, and are forced by their consciences to give up their positions, and consign themselves to inactivity for the future? Will the people of England calmly and indifferently look on when they see some of the most learned, able, and eloquent of the Clergy deprived because they will not submit to be stripped of a liberty which has existed without question in the Church of England since the Reformation? Will they dispassionately consent to the loss of those to whom they have looked up with respect, if not with reverence, and for such a cause?



Will they look with calmness upon those whose lives they admire being expelled from the parishes which they have benefitted, and some of them, it may be, compelled to take refuge in a workhouse? The probable influence upon the people of a course of persecution is realized by some of those whom it will affect, and it would be well if their would-be persecutors would also take the subject to heart. One of the more advanced Ritualists, when I recently spoke to him of the future, replied, "I hope we shall be well persecuted—we have thriven on it in the past and we shall thrive upon it in the future!" For what has been the success of all persecuting efforts in the past? Have they stifled or increased that against which they were levelled? Is the cause against which they banded together stronger or weaker than it was when they commenced their operations? Are its supporters increasing or diminishing in numbers and influence? The answer is too obvious and notorious for me to express it. And, therefore, I do not shrink from saying that the great promoter of Ritualism in this country has been the Church Association. The power of Ritualism in this country would not be what it now is if it had not been for the Church Association. Persecution where it cannot stamp out in unpitiful slaughter and blood ever spreads that which it seeks to destroy. What we want now is peace. We cannot return to the middle ages and root out by force that which we do not like. And the sooner we recognize this, and act upon the knowledge, the better for all of us, and for the Church of which we are members. I am asking for no new liberty, but only that that which we have may not be narrowed. I ask that the liberty which the Church has enjoyed from the Reformation may not be limited or destroyed by the new Court; what the eventual result of such limitation would be it were easy to say. I hope, therefore, no one will be so blinded by party hatred as to hurry to a future which is obviously full of perils, and sufferings, and sorrows. Look before you leap. See what you are aiming at. Realize the

eventual consequences of your actions. Think of something beyond the momentary joy of a triumph. I believe that those who ask for the liberty for which we are now contending are as earnest, as faithful, as loyal members of the Church of England as you will find in her fold. We are not foes in disguise; we do not wish to injure or destroy the Church of England as she is, but to build up and to strengthen her. We have done this in the past; we beg to be allowed to continue to do it in the future. And all that we ask to enable us to do this is, that the Church will not consent to any abridgment of the liberty of any section of her children. It is, I hope, quite understood that there is no intention of altering any doctrine of the Church. We have no wish to do that, and never have had. For party purposes this has been asserted by opponents out of doors, but it has never had the slightest basis of fact on which to rest. I therefore cannot object to the addition which the Dean of Winchester proposes to make. The words are taken from one of our own schedules. We readily assented to their insertion in them, and we are equally willing for them to be transferred as a rider to the resolution I propose. In accepting that declaration I only express what I mean in my heart.

In conclusion, then, I would beg the House most heartily, most sincerely, in this the day given to it, to resolve what it will do in the possibly approaching extremity. Let it not drift, but deliberately resolve, so far as it can, what the course of the Church shall be. If the question was that the Eastward Position should alone be tolerated, I would not agree to it. I should feel it to be an infringement of the liberty of others, and I should object to it as strongly as I should to anything which trenched upon my own liberty. You may now do generously and magnanimously what you may afterwards have to do, if you do it at all, with the air of a patron to a suppliant. Neither side ought to desire to see its brethren humbled. The Evangelical party would feel it to be intolerable to be compelled to celebrate in a position to which its members were

not accustomed. I feel the same. All, then, that I ask the House is, that both sides may continue as heretofore to enjoy the same liberty ; that so the Church may be in the future as in the past the free Church of the free people of England, which, while she does not infringe upon the long-enjoyed liberty of her sons, guards at the same time with jealousy what is primitive and true in her teaching. I conclude by moving—

“ That this House concurs in the recommendation that diversity of Usage as it regards the position of the Celebrant, in the Administration of the Holy Communion, be not interfered with.”







